

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

DREYER

Serial No. 10/606,783

Filed: June 27, 2003

Title: CONVEYOR IDLER



Atty Dkt. 4000-3

C# M#

TC/A.U. 3651

Examiner: Ridley, Richard

Date: October 26, 2005

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/AMENDMENT

This is a response/amendment/letter in the above-identified application and includes an attachment which is hereby incorporated by reference and the signature below serves as the signature to the attachment in the absence of any other signature thereon.

☐ **Correspondence Address Indication Form Attached.**

Fees are attached as calculated below:

Total effective claims after amendment	18	minus highest number	
previously paid for	43	(at least 20) =	0 x \$50.00
			\$0.00 (1202)/\$0.00 (2202) \$

Independent claims after amendment	2	minus highest number	
previously paid for	7	(at least 3) =	0 x \$200.00
			\$0.00 (1201)/\$0.00 (2201) \$

If proper multiple dependent claims now added for first time, (ignore improper); add		
	\$360.00 (1051)/\$180.00 (2051)	\$

Petition is hereby made to extend the current due date so as to cover the filing date of this		
paper and attachment(s)	One Month Extension \$120.00 (1251)/\$60.00 (2251)	
	Two Month Extensions \$450.00 (1252)/\$225.00 (2252)	
	Three Month Extensions \$1020.00 (1253)/\$510.00 (2253)	
	Four Month Extensions \$1590.00 (1254)/\$795.00 (2254)	\$

Terminal disclaimer enclosed, add	\$130.00 (1814)/\$65.00 (2814)	\$
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----

☒ Applicant claims "small entity" status. ☐ Statement filed herewith

Rule 56 Information Disclosure Statement Filing Fee	\$180.00 (1806)	\$
---	-----------------	----

Assignment Recording Fee	\$40.00 (8021)	\$
--------------------------	----------------	----

Other:		\$
--------	--	----

TOTAL FEE ENCLOSED \$ 0.00

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, in the fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Account No. 14-1140. A duplicate copy of this sheet is attached.

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, Virginia 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100
JRL:sd

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.
By Atty: John R. Lastova, Reg. No. 33,149

Signature: _____



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

DREYER

Atty. Ref.: 4000-3; Confirmation No. 9701

Appl. No. 10/606,783

TC/A.U. 3651

Filed: June 27, 2003

Examiner: Ridley, Richard

For: CONVEYOR IDLER

* * * * *

October 26, 2005

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

In response to the Official Action dated September 2, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

The amended claims recite two significant features: (1) an arrangement in which the conveyor belt is supported on and arranged to run on the conveyor idler, and (2) an arrangement in which the outer surface of the conveyor idler provides a braking effect on the conveyor belt. Neither feature is disclosed or suggested in Hagerman or Maurer. Lacking these two features, the rejection based on Maurer and Hagerman should be withdrawn.

Notwithstanding these differences, the Examiner contends it would have been obvious to use the brake element of Maurer in the roller of Hagerman. Applicant disagrees. First, the teaching of Maurer does not relate to rollers but rather to hold back/run back devices. Second, Hagerman requires a wedge member to provide a braking effect on the conveyor. The purpose of the uni-directional roller of Hagerman is merely to cause the wedge member to move to its

DREYER
Appl. No. 10/606,783
October 26, 2005


operative position upon reverse movement of the conveyor belt. In contrast, the claimed roller supports the belt and provides a braking effect on the belt.

The claimed arrangement is elegant and simple as compared to Hagerman. For example, a disadvantage of Hagerman is that the brake devices have to be positioned at the side or marginal edges of the belt run 10 so as not to interfere with the conveyance of material 16. See column 2, lines 31 to 33. In the claims, the conveyor belt is supported on conveyor idler; therefore, there is no possibility of the conveyor idler interfering with the conveyance of material. A further disadvantage of Hagerman relative to the claimed invention is that stanchions 22 are required for each brake device. Such additional structure is not required for the claimed invention.

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:sd
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100